ever, unless operated upon *ab extra.* Matter is equally passive in regard to chemical action. Nay, there is required in order to action, to change, not only a plurality of bodies, but a relation between the properties of these bodies. Oxygen and hydrogen, for instance, unite because they possess the quality of a mutual affinity, and they will not combine except in certain proportions, being according to the law of their affinity. All action or change thus originates in the conjunct operation of two or more bodies, and implies a relation between their properties so as to admit of their mutual action. A material substance existing *alone* in the universe *could not produce any effects.* Give us *two* material substances, and effects *may* follow. Give us these substances in a *relation suited to their properties,* and effects *will* follow. All changes, all effects, do thus proceed from the properties of two or more bodies, these bodies having a relation to each other which enables their properties to act.

When it is said that matter is passive and dependent, every one feels that there is a truth announced which at once commends itself to the judgment. On the other hand, Leibnitz and a class of ^speculators increasing in the present day, endeavour to demonstrate that matter is active. May not both views contain partial truth ? We believe the whole truth to lie in the double doctrine, that matter has inherent active properties, but that these properties are of such a kind that they cannot act unless there is a proper relation adjusted for them. Each separate substance, viewed *per se,* is inert, and will continue in the state in which it happens to be till operated upon *ab extra.* In order to action, there must therefore be two or more bodies, having relation to each other in respect of their properties. In order to beneficial action, there must be a skilfully arranged, and we believe divinely appointed, relation of bodies to one another. In

respect of its properties, matter is active, it has a *virtus,* (this is the word which Leibnitz* uses as explanatory of his meaning,) and we believe that it would be as irreligious as it is unphiio-sophical to deny this its inherent power. " In that great system," says Brown, " which we call the universe, all things are what they are in consequence of God's primary will; but if they were wholly incapable of affecting anything, they would virtually

* See Lettro iv., CEuvros, par M. A. Jacques, T'rom, Ser, There arc curious discussions iu the whole of the ICH.W works of Leitmits.